REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested for Claims 1, 6, and 11. Claims 2-5 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 6-349663. Claims 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 6-349663 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,872,261 to *Sanyal et al.* Claim 1, as amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claim 5, defines a screen-printing plate including a screen plate provided with two or more printing patterns disposed in a single plate frame of the screen plate, each of the two or more printing patterns being formed with a plurality of mesh holes, wherein , for at least two of the at least two or more printing patterns, a first one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a first size and a second one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a second size, wherein a first group of mesh holes is closer to a periphery of the plate frame than a second group of mesh holes and has holes that are larger than holes for the second group of mesh holes.

JP 6-349663 (a translation of which is attached) discloses a screen-printing plate having openings 14 that are larger toward a center of a screen plate part 11 and smaller closer to an emulsion part 12. This arrangement facilitates avoiding a "saddle effect" as illustrated in FIG. 3 that is achieved through prior art screen printing plates as seen in FIG. 2 having openings 14 that are all the same size.

Senyel et al. is cited in combination with JP 6-349663 as disclosing mesh holes 36 closer to a periphery of a stencil that are larger than mesh holes 40 near a center. It is

asserted that it would have been obvious to modify JP 6-349663 with mesh holes arranged as in *Senyel et al.*

It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not have modified JP 6-349663 in the manner asserted in the Official Action in view of *any* prior art disclosure because such a modification would be directly contrary to the object of the invention disclosed in JP 6-349663 and would destroy the invention of JP 6-349663 for its intended function. A modification to a reference that would destroy it for its intended function is, of course, impermissible.

In view of the differences between Claim 1 and JP 6-349663 in view of *Sanyal et al.* and the fact that those documents would not have been combined in the manner asserted in the Official Action, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is not anticipated by and defines patentably over these documents.

Claim 6, as amended to incorporate subject matter of claim 9, defines a method for manufacturing an electronic device. The method includes forming two or more printed patterns on a ceramic green sheet by pressing electrode paste through a plurality of mesh holes in two or more printing patterns in a screen-printing plate, wherein, for at least two of the two or more printing patterns, a first one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a first size and a second one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a second size, and wherein electrode paste is pressed through a first group of mesh holes in a first region of the screen-printing plate having the first size and a second group of mesh holes in a second region of the screen-printing plate having the second size, and the second region is proximate a peripheral frame of the screen-printing

plate and the first region is proximate a center of the screen-printing plate, wherein the first size is smaller than the second size.

As discussed above with regard to claim 1, JP 6-349663 discloses a stencil with openings that are largest toward the center of the stencil to avoid a "saddle effect." One skilled in the art would not have modified JP 6-349663 in view of any reference to put larger openings toward the periphery and smaller openings toward the center because such a modification would destroy the invention for its intended function.

In view of the differences between Claim 6 and JP 6-349663 in view of *Sanyal et al.* and the fact that those documents would not have been combined in the manner asserted in the Official Action, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 6 is not anticipated by and defines patentably over these documents. Claim 11, which depends from claim 6, defines patentably over the documents for at least the same reasons as claim 6.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims define patentably over the cited references. Allowance of the present application is cordially urged.

If the Examiner should be of the opinion that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: _____
Harold R. Brown III
Registration No. 36,341

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: May 27, 2003

APPENDIX

Amend the claims to read as follows:

1. (Three Times Amended) A screen-printing plate comprising:

a screen plate provided with two or more printing patterns disposed in a single plate frame of the screen plate, each of the two or more printing patterns being formed with a plurality of mesh holes,

wherein , for at least two of the at least two or more printing patterns, a first one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a first size and a second one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a second size,

wherein a first group of mesh holes is closer to a periphery of the plate frame than a second group of mesh holes and has holes that are larger than holes for the second group of mesh holes.

Cancel claims 2-5 without prejudice or disclaimer.

6. (Three Times Amended) A method for manufacturing an electronic device, comprising the steps of:

forming two or more printed patterns on a ceramic green sheet by pressing electrode paste through a plurality of mesh holes in two or more printing patterns in a screen-printing plate, wherein, for at least two of the two or more printing patterns, a first one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a first size and a second one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a second size, and wherein electrode

paste is pressed through a first group of mesh holes in a first region of the screen-printing plate having the first size and a second group of mesh holes in a second region of the screen-printing plate having the second size, and the second region is proximate a peripheral frame of the screen-printing plate and the first region is proximate a center of the screen-printing plate

wherein the first size is smaller than the second size.

Cancel claim 9 without prejudice or disclaimer.